

A
 VINDICATION
 OF THE
 DOCTRINE
 OF THE
 GODHEAD of JESUS CHRIST,
 IN ANSWER TO
 MR. S. KINGSFORD'S PUBLICATION
 ENTITLED
 THE SUPREMACY OF GOD THE FATHER; AND THE
 INFERIORITY AND SUBORDINATION OF JESUS
 CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD; ASSERTED
 AND PROVED.

BY JOHN KNOTT.

“ The Word was God.” John, chap. i, ver. 1.
 “ Who is over all, God blessed for ever.” Rom. chap. ix. ver. 5.
 “ Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be
 equal with God.” Phil. chap. ii, ver. 6.”

ROCHESTER :

PRINTED BY CHRISTOPHER ETHERINGTON,
 N^o 181, *High Street*.

Sold by W. BUTTON, N^o 24, *Paternoster Row*, LONDON.

[Price Fourpence.]



G

T

he
ho
un
tra
riv
we
or

de
no
co
fr
h
el
th
b
in
o
P
P

A
VINDICATION
OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE
GODHEAD OF CHRIST.

THE importance of the controversy respecting the person of Christ is obvious ; if he be really God, he is worthy of supreme confidence, and superlative honor is his due. To withhold these is to treat him unworthily, it is to rob him of his glory. On the contrary, if he be not supreme God, but a Being of derived existence and dependant power ; or, in other words, a Creature : to place in him supreme confidence, or render him supreme honor, must be idolatry.

Much has been said and written on the subject. I do not apprehend that Mr. Kingsford has thrown any new light on it, before persons acquainted with the controversy ; nor do I expect to do it myself ; but as from the size of his publication, it is likely to fall into the hands of persons who have neither opportunity, or inclination, to read larger or more laborious treatises on the subject, it may not be unnecessary for something to be wrote in reply, nearly of the same size. In attempting this myself, I have the happiness of having for my opponent, a gentleman for whom I sincerely profess personal respect, and who has written with such temper as is not likely to provoke to any thing more than

that calm discussion which the importance of the subject calls for.

Mr. Kingsford in his Introduction enumerates what he calls, " Sources of Trinitarian Deception." I shall not, however, particularly consider those here, intending after having examined what he produces in favor of his sentiments, to give the reasons of my own faith, according to my views of the Word of God.

Our Author having stated his proposed general heads, begins with the Supremacy of the Father.

It is proper here to observe, that the Trinitarians do not deny that the Father is supreme God ; But that he is not so to the exclusion of the Son, and the Spirit, these three divine persons existing in one undivided essence. But Mr. Kingsford contends for the supremacy of the Father, to the exclusion of the Son.

Farther, Trinitarians do not deny the supremacy of the Divine Father to Jesus Christ ; considered as man, and mediator. But Mr. Kingsford contends for the supremacy of the Father over him, in his *highest capacity*. P. 1.

His arguments are professedly drawn from the proper source, the sacred Scripture. How conclusive they are, let us now examine.

Matthew, chap. xix, ver. 17. " Why callest thou me good, there is none good but one, that is God."

From

From hence, he argues that the Father only is good, in the highest possible, and most perfect sense. I reply, our Lord does not say, there is none good but *my Father*; but, there is none good but *God*. It does not in the least appear, that our Lord was speaking of the Father *personally*, and therefore the passage is impertinantly produced. To me it appears, that our Lord in this, and other parts of the conversation narrated in that context, answered the enquirer on his own principles. He asked, "What good thing shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?" plainly implying, that he expected eternal life as the reward of good works, to be performed by him; on this principle our Lord replies, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." And yet we know, from the testimony of an inspired Apostle, "that by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified before God;" Romans, chap. iii, ver. 20. And that, "as many as are of the works of the law, are under its curse;" Gal. chap. 3, ver. 10. Again, the enquirer addressed our Lord by a term, which in its highest sense, was proper to God only; and yet was ignorant of his divinity: suitably to the man's conviction, on his own principles, Jesus replied, "why callest thou me good?" &c.

John, chap. xvii, ver. 3; "That they may know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Mr. Kingsford's argument from this passage, p. 3, is plausible, but to me, not convincing. Jesus Christ is in the sacred Scriptures repeatedly styled God; John, chap. i, ver. 1; Romans, chap. ix, ver. 5. Is he then a false God? No, he is said to be the True

God; I. John, chap. v, ver. 20; (of which passages more in the sequel.) In the passage now under consideration, the Father is stiled the only True God, not to the exclusion of the Son, and Spirit, as subsisting in the same undivided essence; but as distinguished from the false pretended gods of the Heathen. The Father is, indeed, in the text distinguished from Jesus Christ, as our author observes, but it is not from him, considered simply as a divine person, but in his official character as mediator, sent into the world for the salvation of those who were given to him by the Father.

The consideration of the distinct parts sustained by the three divine persons, in the great business of salvation, with their different characters in consequence thereof, together with the opposition of the true God to idols, will obviate the force of the arguments, drawn from the remaining passages, quoted by Mr. Kingsford in this first chapter, which are, Romans, chap. xvi. ver. 27, I. Timothy, chap. vi, ver. 6, I. Corinthians, chap. xi, ver. 3, and chap. i, ver. 30, Ephesians, chap. i, ver. 3, Philippians, chap. ii, ver. 11. I would particularly consider, what he says from them; but it would be but a repetition in substance, of the same things, and counteract my design of brevity.

Mr. Kingsford's second chapter is entitled, "The Unity, or Oneness of God." P. 6.

I must here observe, that the subject of controversy, is not, whether God is one, or that there is but one
God;

God: This, Trinitarians, as well as those who call themselves Unitarians, contend for as an important truth; but the question is, whether the Scriptures attribute such a oneness to God, as is inconsistent with the mysterious subsistence of three divine persons, in the one divine essence. This, the passages produced by Mr. Kingsford do not in my judgment prove; Mark, chap. xii, ver. 32, "There is but one God," does not. It is a truth equally admitted on all hands. Nor, Galatians, chap. iii. ver. 20, "a mediator, is not the mediator of one, but God is one" (i. e.) meditation, supposes the existence of two parties, an offending, and an offended party; but God is one, perfectly happy in himself, if therefore, there had not been a race of wretched offending beings, there would have been no ground for the mediatorial character and work of Christ. This is the natural import of the text. How short of our Author's purpose!

Nor, Ephesians, chap. iv, ver. 4, 5, 6, or, James, chap. ii, ver. 19. "That there is one God and Father of all," or one supreme first cause, is a truth none dispute, but with respect to the mode of subsistence of this one first cause, the text says nothing.

Nor, John, chap. iv, ver. 24, "God is a spirit." True, but has our Author such a perfect comprehension of the nature of spirits, especially of the great Father of Spirits, as to ascertain, that it is impossible for him to be in different respects, one and three? For my own part, I find that many things respecting my own spirit,

spirit, are far beyond my comprehension. I am not surprized it should be so with respect to my God.

Mark, chap. xii, ver. 29. "The Lord our God is one Lord;" is a quotation rather unfavorable than otherwise to Mr. Kingsford's hypothesis. The words are taken from Deuteronomy, chap. vi, ver. 4, and are literally, "Jehovah Elohim, one Jehovah." Jehovah is singular, Elohim plural. So that the text, strictly rendered would be, "The Lord our Gods, is one Lord. Thus strongly implying, a plurality of persons in the one divine essence.

Those who wish to see this matter critically discussed, I would refer to Dr. Gill on the Trinity, chap. 2d.

I only add, that the same truth is strongly confirmed by the plural forms of expression, respecting God, which occur in sacred writ, as Genesis, chap. i, ver. 26; "Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." Genesis, chap. iii, ver. 22. "The Lord God said, the man is become as one of *us*;" chap. xi, ver. 7, "Go to, let *us* go down, and there confound their language." Isaiah, chap. vi, ver. 8; "Whom shall I send, and who will go for *us*?" Job, chap. xxxv, ver. 10; "Where is God my *makers*?" Ecclesiastes, chap. xii, ver. 1; "Remember *thy* *Creators*, in the days of thy youth" I know not what tolerable sense, can be put upon these, and other similar forms of expression; without the admission of a plurality of persons in God, an Elohim in Jehovah.

Mr.

Mr. Kingsford's reasoning, in page 8, goes on the principle of our believing, that Father, Son, and Spirit, are three distinct beings, as much as Peter, James, and John, were distinct men, which is not Trinitarianism; but Tritheism: and is therefore calculated to mislead. What we believe is not, that Father, Son, and Spirit, are three Gods; but that they are three persons, in the one divine essence.

Before I quit this chapter, I cannot but remark, that the scripture passages produced by Mr. Kingsford were intentionally levelled against the Pagan Polytheism of one supreme, and other subordinate deities; a system to which Arianism is nearly allied.

Mr. Kingsford's third chapter is entitled, "God the Father, the only object of supreme worship and adoration."

"There are, (he says,) three degrees by which the subject may be distinguished, civil, subordinate, and supreme worship; p. 10. That the term is sometimes in sacred scripture applied to civil respect, I acknowledge; but that religious worship, is to be distinguished into supreme and subordinate, is, I think, an unscriptural and unreasonable fancy. The passages quoted by our Author are far from proving it. I. Chron. chap. xxix, ver. 20. "They worshipped God and the King." To Jehovah they undoubtedly paid religious adoration; but was it such, they rendered to the King? surely not. If they had, they must have been gross idolators,

idolators, and have acted in direct opposition to the divine injunction, " thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve," Deut. chap vi, ver. 13, 14; frequently, as the passage above has been introduced into the controversy, nothing can be well more impertinent: the worship they rendered to the King, most certainly was civil homage, not religious adoration. The only proper object of this, is, the supreme first cause, the great creator, preserver, observer, and judge of all. The notion of supreme and subordinate religious worship, is much better suited to the Heathen Mythology, or to the saint worship of the Papists to their Latria and Dulia, than to the Creed of a Protestant, with the Bible in his hand, which is utterly repugnant to the dangerous distinction. If, therefore, it can be made appear from the sacred Scriptures, that Jesus Christ is a proper object of religious worship, (which I shall attempt to do in its place) it will consequently follow, that he is God, a partaker of that divine essence which is the alone proper object of religious adoration.

Rev. chap. xix, ver. 10. " See thou do it not, &c. worship God;" to which may be added, chap. xxii, ver. 8, though quoted by Mr. Kingsford, are forcibly conclusive to my purpose; it was not merely supreme adoration, but all kind of religious worship that the Angel with such determined firmness refuses.

I do not see it at all necessary to follow Mr. Kingsford in his remarks on the other passages quoted in this chapter.

chapter. I shall therefore proceed to chap. 4, "On the person, and identity of Christ."

In this chapter, Mr. Kingsford produces evidence to prove, "That Jesus Christ is one conscious being, not two beings, and where Scripture speaks of the words and works of Jesus, they apply to the whole of him, as an undivided person," p. 14. I know not who will dispute the truth of this proposition; for my own part; I have no inclination to do it, shall therefore leave him in quiet possession of the evidence adduced.

But though Jesus Christ be one person, yet the Scriptures teach me that in that one person, exist two distinct natures. On this subject let the following Scriptures be considered; Romans, chap. ix, ver. 5. "Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as *concerning the flesh*, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, amen." When the Apostle says of Christ restrictively *as concerning the flesh*, (i. e.) his humanity, he came of the Fathers, does it not necessarily imply, that he is possessed of a superior nature not so derived? and what this nature is, is plain from what follows.—It is the divine, for he, "is over all God blessed for ever." He is here distinguished by a divine title, "God;" and to him is attributed that universal dominion, and immutable blessedness, which are proper to God alone. Compare I. John, chap. i. ver. 14, and II. Phil. chap. vi. ver. 8.

Hebrews, chap. ii. ver. 16. "For verily he took not on him the nature of Angels, but the seed of Abraham."

The

The inspired writer evidently supposes, it would have been as possible for the Son of God, to have taken on him the nature of Angels, as to have taken on him the seed of Abraham; had he so done, there must surely, have been two distinct natures existing in one person. Mr. Kingsford notwithstanding his affectation of perspicuity, really writes with great ambiguity on the person of Christ. He evidently affirms him to have existed, prior to his formation in the womb of the Virgin; yea, prior to the creation of the world, in which he allows him to have had a concern, p. 9. But what existed, a human soul or some other kind of being; a creature or a Demi-God, we are left to conjecture. If the pre-existent Jesus was merely a human soul, had he taken on him the nature of Angels, there must have been two distinct natures in one person. But if of a nature, essentially superior both to Angels and men; which one would think he believed, as he calls him, "that Divine Being," p. 13, it must be equally so in the real, as in the supposed case, and in any view, there can be no more difficulty in the existence of two natures in one person in the one case, than in the other; though the modus thereof be infinitely beyond the limits of human comprehension. I observe, that as the two distinct natures, divine and human, exist in the one person, Jesus Christ, so the Scriptures attribute the peculiar properties of the one, or of the other, to the whole person. Thus, John, chap. iii, ver. xiii, "Even the *Son of Man* which is in *Heaven*;" Acts, chap. xx, ver. 28, "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Not that the humanity of Christ could be in Heaven and on earth

earth at the same time ; or that deity could bleed or die ; but immensity and passability were united in that one person, who is both God and man. “ Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh.”

Mr. Kingsford's sixth chapter, is entitled, “ Jesus Christ a distinct being from the Father.”

I shall on this only state my sentiment, and make a brief remark or two.

My sentiment is, not that Jesus Christ as God is a distinct being from the Father, but that he is a distinct person, subsisting in the same essence or being with the Father, and the Spirit. When as God, he is spoken of as distinct from the Father, it respects not being, (i. e.) essence, but personality.

Remark 1st. That all the difficulty attending the subject, arises from its immensity, together with the shallowness of our conceptions, and the imperfection of our knowledge. On such a subject, it is but reasonable to expect difficulties, and the height of arrogance to determine, to believe nothing but what can be so explained, as to be brought down to the limits of human comprehension. “ Canst thou by searching find out God ? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection ? It is high as Heaven, what canst thou do ? deeper than hell what canst thou know ? ” What God hath condescended to

B

reveal

réveal of himself in his Word it is my duty to believe, without arrogantly exclaiming, "*how* can these things be."

2dly. That many of the passages quoted by Mr. Kingsford respect Christ, not simply as God, but as God Man, Mediator, in which view he is essentially distinct from the Father : it not being to the person of the Father, but to that of the Son, that the man Christ Jesus is taken into personal union, for the gracious purposes of salvation.

I proceed to chapter the sixth, entitled, " The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is a Being inferior to, and dependent on the Father."

I would here premise that in some respects, (i. e.) as man and mediator, Jesus Christ is, we acknowledge, inferior to, and dependent on the father. The Scriptures expressive of this, are eagerly caught at by our opponents, and then they triumph as if they had gained their cause, when in fact they have proved nothing, but what is on all hands readily admitted. But to proceed, Mr. Kingsford argues first, that the Lord Jesus Christ received his being and existence from the Father. p. 22.

In proof of this we are referred to John, chap. iii. ver. 16. " The only begotten of the Father;" and the compellation in many places used by our Lord, " My Father."

But,

But, to argue from hence, that Christ in his highest capacity hath but a derived existence, is inconsistent with those passages which speak of his existence as eternal ; as, *Isaiah. chap. ix. ver. 6.* “ The everlasting Father ; ” *Revelations, chap. xxii, ver. 13.* “ I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.” How could he with propriety thus speak of himself, if a being existed before him, from whom his existence was derived, and on whom he was dependent ? The full import of the phrases, it may be perhaps impossible for us to define ; Mr. Kingsford himself seems to think so ; “ Not, says he, that I can define the manner of the son’s being brought into existence, by no means, &c.” This, however, we may safely conclude that they are expressive of the near union, and ineffable delight subsisting between the Father and the Son : and we can be under no necessity, of affixing such a sense to them ; as is inconsistent with the plain testimony of the Holy Ghost in the sacred pages. Let it be farther observed, that the Jews, who were at least as likely to understand the meaning of phrases in use among them, as our author can be, considered them in a very different light ; to wit, as importing an equality with the Father ; which construction was in no wise contradicted by our Lord, see *John, chap. xv. ver. 17. 23.* Respecting *John. chap. v. ver. 26.* “ So hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.” And *chap. vi. ver. 27.* “ I live by the Father.” They respect Jesus Christ, not simply as God, but as mediator, in which capacity we acknowledge him to be, (as before premised) inferior to and dependent on the

B 2

Father,

Father, and to have received from him a communicative fulness of life and blessedness to bestow on his people.

When he is styled by the Apostle, Colossians, chap. i, ver. 15. "The first born of every creature." The expression is, I apprehend, figurative and expressive of his pre-eminence above all creatures, as the first born of the family used to have over the younger parts; or by a small variation, of a single point, the text might be rendered, "the bringer forth of every creature;" very agreeable to the following context, "for by him were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in earth, &c." The same Idea it is naturally to annex to Revelation, chap. iii, ver. 14. "The beginning of the creation of God." That is, him from whom all things began, being produced by his power.

Mr. Kingsford says, 2dly. That the inferiority of the Lord Jesus Christ appears from the communications of God the Father to him, he instances Colossians, chap. i, ver. 19. and other places. What has been already premised, at the beginning of this chapter is, I think, a sufficient answer to what he here argues. I shall not, therefore, descend to particulars: I only observe, that it is not at all strange, that the Father should not be said, to receive communications of power, wisdom, &c. from the Son, because it is not the Father, but the Son, who in the gracious plan formed by infinite wisdom, hath taken human nature into personal union with himself; and who in that person sustains the mediatorial office.

One passage may be thought to require more particular notice. Mark, chap. xii, ver. 32, "But of that day and that hour, knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." To this I would contrast John, chap. xxi, ver. 17. "Lord thou knowest all things." How are these different declarations to be reconciled? I apprehend, by distinguishing the two natures in the person of Christ. As man, his knowledge was derived, progressive, and limited; but as God he knew all things. All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid in him.

Mr. Kingsford, indeed, argues, p. 25. that admitting this distinction, both natures are excluded by the text, the human, in that it is said, "No man." And afterwards neither the Son. But the seeming force of this criticism is easily obviated. By, "No man," in the text is intended, no mere man, which Jesus Christ never was, his humanity having never existed but in personal union with the Son of God. It is, to the last degree, futile to suppose that our Lord meant to include himself under that description. It is under the term Son, only, that he speaks of himself in the text.

I do not judge it necessary, to follow Mr. Kingsford through the remaining sections of this chapter, or particularly reply to his arguments, from the texts he has quoted: what has been already said, applied to the passages referred to, will, I flatter myself, by the intelligent reader, be thought sufficient to destroy the force of Mr. Kingsford's deductions from them.

PART THE SECOND.

Having replied, as far as to me appeared necessary, to what Mr. Kingsford has offered in support of his hypothesis, that the Lord Jesus Christ is, even in his highest capacity inferior to the Father; I shall now endeavour to prove from the sacred Scriptures, that he is truly God, and as such equal to the Divine Father.

In doing this, I shall observe the following method, and shew,

1st. That what the sacred Scriptures say of the gift of Christ, for the redemption of men, and of the love of the Father and Son as displayed in that event, is reconcileable to no hypothesis, but that which considers him as God.

2d. That the peculiar titles of God are given to him.

3d. That the peculiar perfections of God are ascribed to him.

4th. That the special works of God are said to be wrought by him.

5th. That the honors due to God alone are given to him.

And 6thly. That passages in the Old Testament, which were evidently spoken of the Supreme Being, are
in

in the New, expressly applied to Jesus Christ. All this I doubt not clearly to prove from the sacred Scriptures; and if all this be demonstrated, surely the Godhead of Christ must be irrefragably established.

1st. The Scriptures represent the gift of Christ for men as the greatest of all gifts, and as the highest display of divine love. As the greatest of all gifts. Romans, chap. viii. ver. 32. "He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all; how shall he not with him freely give us all things?"

The Apostle forcibly argues from the greater to the less, from the donation of Christ as the greater, to the donation of all things as the less. But if Jesus Christ be not a person of infinite dignity and worth (i. e.) God; I cannot perceive the propriety of his reasoning, the blessings of providence, of grace, and of glory, being of such inconceivable value, that it can be scarcely possible to conceive, how the gift of any single finite being can surpass them all. As the highest possible display of divine love, thus, John, chap. iii. ver. 16. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c." Romans, chap. v. ver. 8. "God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." I cannot see how this is to be accounted for either on the Socinian or the Arian hypotheses. That God should pardon my sins, give me good things in this life, and Heaven in the issue, I can easily conceive expresses wonderful love; but how the gift of one individual being, essentially and infinitely inferior to himself, (as on either of these hypotheses Jesus Christ must

must be) for the salvation of millions, can be considered as the most unparalled instance of divine love, I cannot conceive.

Again, the Scriptures speak of Christ's love to his church in giving himself for it, as such, the heights and depths of which are unfathomable, it passeth knowledge; Ephesians, chap. iii. ver. 19. But take away the divine dignity of his person, and I can see no reason for speaking so highly of his love; for if he be not God, the reward of his sufferings, in the essential increase of his personal happiness and glory, must have been an ample compensation for all that he could have possibly suffered in the short period of his life on earth, and, consequently, self-interest, independent of any extraordinary love, would have induced him, as a wise being, to have accepted of the proposal, and to have undertook the work. To me it appears, that the dignity of Immanuel's person is inseparably connected with the scriptural account of redeeming love; so that take away the one, and you destroy the other. I forbear to enlarge on these ideas, those who wish for it, may see them clearly and forcibly stated in Abbadie on the Divinity of Christ, which I recommend to their perusal.

2dly. The peculiar titles of deity are given to Christ. For instance, he is expressly called God, John, chap. i. ver. 1. "The Word was God;" Isaiah, chap. ix. ver. 6. "The mighty God;" Romans, chap. ix, ver. 5, "Who is over all God blessed for ever." Mr. Kingsford indeed says, that the term is relative,
and

and that it is given to others beside the Supreme Being; but of this he has produced no example, nor do I believe it is possible to produce any passage of sacred writ wherein it is (except in a qualified sense) given to any but to the true God; on the contrary, inspired writers positively use it as peculiar to the great Supreme. Thus, II Samuel, chap. vii. ver. 22. "Wherefore thou art great, O Lord God, neither is there *any God besides thee.*" Psalm. lxxxvi, ver. 10, "Thou art *God alone.*" Isaiah. chap. xlv. ver. 6. "Besides me there is *no God.*" I. Corinthians, chap. viii. ver. 4. "There is none other *God but One.*" When I consider these and many other passages, and yet find Jesus Christ in the most absolute and unqualified way stiled God, I cannot but conclude that he really is so; a divine person subsisting in the one undivided essence; or that the Scriptures are directly calculated to lead us to idolatry.

Again, Jehovah, is a title peculiar to the Supreme Being. This was the distinguishing character by which he made himself known to Moses, Exodus, chap. vii, ver. 3. This the psalmist asserts to belong to him only, Psalm. lxxxiii. ver. 18. "That men may know, that those whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over the whole earth." Perfectly agreeable with which, is what Israel's God says of himself, Isaiah. chap. xlii. ver. 8. "I am Jehovah, *that is my name,* and my glory will I not give unto another." And yet this peculiar title which the great God thus appropriates to himself, and which his inspired servant declares, belongs to him
alone,

alone, is most expressly given to the Lord Jesus Christ, "This is the name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness." Jeremiah. chap. xxiii. ver. 6. Strange indeed, if Jesus Christ is not really God. "The First and the Last," is another of the peculiar titles of the most high. Isaiah. chap. xlv. ver. 6. "I am the First, and I am the Last; and besides me there is no God." See also, chap. xli. ver. 4. and chap. xlviii. ver. 12. It is peculiar to him, who is the first cause and final end of all things; yet this title is repeatedly assumed by Jesus Christ. See Rev. chap. i. ver. 11, 17. chap. ii. ver. 8. and chap. xxii. ver. 13. Names are given to persons or things for the purpose of distinction; or that they may be known or distinguished the one from the other; as a man from a beast; an Angel from a worm; God from a creature. To apply to one species or thing, the distinguishing name of another, is to confuse and mislead, which is utterly unworthy that infinitely wise Spirit, by whom the Scriptures were dictated. If, therefore, the peculiar appellations of deity, are in those sacred writings given to Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows that he is God.

3dly. As divine titles are given to him, so divine perfections are attributed to him. Instance 1st. Self-existence. Only God exists of himself, all other beings have an existence derived from, and dependent on him.

The self-existence of God is implied in the term Jehovah, which we have before seen is applied to Christ. It is also expressed, Exodus. chap. iii. ver. 14. by "I
am

am that I am." Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, " I Am, hath sent me unto you." " I AM THAT I AM." (i. e.) I am that I am of myself, independent of any other being or cause. The person that thus spake to Moses out of the bush, was no less than the God of the Fathers. ver. 6. 13. The self-existent Jehovah, the eternal I AM. And yet it could not be personally the divine Father, because he is called the Angel of the Lord, ver. 2. an appellation which never is, nor indeed could with any propriety be given to the Father; but is with propriety, agreeable to the economy of salvation, given to the divine Son, who is elsewhere stiled, the Lord's messenger or Angel, and the messenger or Angel of the covenant. Mal. chap. iii. ver. 1. And the same term, by which the self-existence of Jehovah is expressed, in the above passage, is by our Lord expressly used with reference to himself, John, chap. viii. ver. 58. " Before Abraham was I am." It is not merely priority of existence to Abraham, that Jesus there asserts: if that only had been the Idea he meant to convey, it would have been, " I was before Abraham," or some similar form of expression; not, " before Abraham was I am:" this naturally conveys the idea of eternal, immutable, independent existence; especially, considered together with the passage in Exodus. Before considered.

Again, omniscience, is another attribute peculiar to God. Creature knowledge is derived and limited; but divine knowledge is infinite. It is to Jehovah, as the omniscient God, that the most secret recesses of the human heart lie open. " O Lord, (says the psalmist) thou hast searched

searched me and know me, thou understandest my thoughts afar off, such knowledge is too wonderful for me ; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." Psalm. cxxxix. ver. 1. 6. And with what solemnity doth Solomon assert this as the peculiar prerogative of God. " Thou, *even thou only*, knowest the hearts of all the children of men." I. Kings. chap. viii. ver. 39. Yet one of the inspired apostles of Christ, asserts, that he, (Christ) knew all things. John. chap. xxi. ver. 17. Another, that he needed not that any should testify of man ; for he knew what was in man. John. chap. ii. ver. 25. Another, that there is no creature, that is not manifest in his sight ; but that all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him, with whom we have to do," (i. e.) as the context plainly determines, of Jesus our great high priest, Jesus the son of God. Heb. chap. iv. ver. 13. 14. And our Lord himself, scruples not to assume to himself this special prerogative of God. " All the churches shall know, that I am he that searcheth the reins and the hearts." Rev. chap. ii. ver. 23. Can any thing be more decisive ?

Once more, Omnipotence is certainly a peculiar attribute of deity. He is, " the Almighty God." Gen. chap. xvii. ver. 2. Rev. chap. xix. ver. 6.

But the might, not of a Creature ; but of God, is attributed to our strong deliverer. He is, " The mighty God." Isaiah. chap. ix. ver. 6. " Behold, the Lord God shall come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him." Isaiah. chap. xl. ver. 10. That the

the person spoken of by the prophet, was the expected Messiah is evident from the context; and from the application of it in the New Testament Matt. chap. iii. ver. 3: and parallel places. The power of a God, beamed forth through the veil of humanity, when, with the voice of sovereign authority, he spake the dead to life, and hushed the raging elements :

“ Lazarus come forth.” Was his efficacious command, and the dead obeyed his voice. “ Peace, be still,” was his sovereign mandate, and the winds and waves obeyed John chap. xi. ver. 43.

Mr. Kingsford, indeed, endeavours, p. 8. to enervate the force of evidence, arising from the miracles of our Lord, by referring to those of his Apostles; but whatever they performed, was *in the name* of Christ, and they were careful lest they should be attributed to any power or virtue of their own. Acts. chap. iii. ver. 6. 12. chap. xiv. ver. 14. 15. He, on the contrary, acted in *his own name*, putting forth a sovereign power in a way which it would have been the height of impious arrogance for them to have pretended to imitate.

Again, our Lord expressly attributes omnipotence to himself. “ I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” Rev. chap. i. ver. 8. That Jesus Christ is the person there speaking is evident it is of him that John has

been speaking in the preceeding verse. To him the title of Lord is especially appropriated in the New Testament, and he is the person who uniformly, in the book of Revelations, speaks of himself as the Alpha and Omega. He, then, is the Almighty, a person subsisting in the divine essence, the Almighty God.

Other divine perfections might be mentioned as attributed to Christ: As omnipresence, and eternity. Matt. chap. 18. ver 20. Heb. chap. xiii. ver. 8. But I forbear to enlarge.

4thly. Another source of irrefragable evidence to the Godhead of Christ is, the ascription of the peculiar works of God to him, by inspired writers. I shall instance two, the creation, and the ~~conversion~~ *conservation* of all things.

Creation is *a peculiar* work of God. "In the begining God created the Heaven and the earth." Gen. chap. i. ver. 1. yet the work of creation is ascribed to Christ. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." John. chap. i ver. 3. "All things were created by him and for him." Col. chap. i. ver. 16. Mr. Kingsford allows Christ to have had a concern in
the

the creation, intro. p. 9. But then, it is only as an instrument by whom God the Father performed the work. But it should be observed, that creation is such a work as precludes the idea of instrumentality; it is the production of something out of nothing. This was effected solely by the divine fiat. Gen. chap. i. ver. 3. 6. &c.

Inferior beings, as instruments may be, and are employed by God in the *modification* of matter created; but reason dictates, that creation itself must be prior to this, and that it is solely the work of God. The sacred Scriptures are very decisive to the purpose. "I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens *alone*, that spreadeth abroad the earth *by myself*." Isai. chap. xlv. ver. 24. If, therefore, all things were made by Jesus Christ, he must be God my creator, whom I am to remember, reverence, and adore as such.

Again, he who made, conserves and governs the worlds he hath created; "It is in him we live, and move, and have our being." Acts. chap. xvii. ver. 28. But conservation as well as creation is attributed to Christ; "By him all things *consist*." Col.

chap. i. ver. 17. " Upholding all things by the word of his power," Heb. chap. i. ver. 3.

6thly. The Scriptures direct us to give the honors, due to God only, to Jesus Christ. He himself has told us, " that all men should honor the Son, *even* as (or like as) they honor the Father." John. chap. v. ver. 23. His Apostle says of him, that " being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. chap. ii. ver. 6. If he were not really God, one in essence with the Father, the difference between God and him must be infinite; and it would have been the most impious robbery for him to have claimed an equality with God: yet this, that Jesus who is set before us in the context, as a pattern of humility, did do. A decisive proof that he is indeed God.

Thomas, when recovered from a fit of unbelief, gave unto the Saviour divine honor. He, " said unto him, my Lord and my God." Strange language indeed for the Apostle to use; or for Jesus to receive if he were not the true God.

Religious worship, which, as we have already seen, belongs to God only, is to be given to Jesus Christ. Thus, in baptism, a very solemn act of religious

religious worship, the subject is to be baptized equally in the name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, as of the divine Father;—the authority of each of the sacred three is in that act equally recognized; faith in them equally professed; and dedication to the service of each equally performed.

Prayer, another important part of religious worship, is also addressed to Christ. Thus, by Stephen, the proto-martyr of the christian church. “They stoned Stephen calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit.” Acts. chap. vii. ver. 59. If Jesus Christ is not God, Stephen died in the act of idolatry.

Christians are characterised by the Apostle Paul as those, “who call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.” 1. Cor. chap. i. ver. 2. It could be only in prayer, as a branch of religious worship, that they called upon him. Primitive christians were not Arians; such may indeed call upon the Father in the name of Christ; but they do not call upon his name, (i. e.) address prayer to him. Indeed, they cannot with consistency do it, denying, as they do, his divinity.

Angels are directed to worship the Son. Heb. chap. i. ver. 6. And divine worship is rendered

to him by glorified saints in Heaven. Rev. chap. v. ver. 13. "and every creature which is in Heaven, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him, that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." This is an ascription of glory and praise of the highest kind, rendered to the Lamb in common with the divine Father.

7thly. The inspired writers of the New Testament, do, in many Instances, apply passages in the Old Testament, which were evidently spoken of the Supreme Being, to Jesus Christ. Thus Psal. cii. ver. 24. and 27. "I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations, of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth: and the Heavens are the work of thy hands, they shall perish but thou shall endure, &c." Who can doubt, but that the Psalmist is there addressing the Supreme Being: the disposer of life: the Creator of Heaven and earth: the Eternal and immutable God? And yet this very passage is expressly applied to Jesus Christ. Heb. chap. i. ver 10. and 12. When these passages are compared, and these things are considered, what can the Bible Christian possibly conclude, but that Jesus Christ is God.

Again,

Again, *Isaiah. chap. xxxv. ver. 4.* “ Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not : behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence, he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, &c.” What idea would an Israelite have naturally formed of the person the prophet speaks of under the terms, “ your God :” “ even God :” and to whom he attributes the salvation of Israel, with the destruction of their foes? Surely he must have understood the prophet as speaking of the Lord God of Israel. Of him, who says elsewhere, “ I am the Lord and there is none else, a just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me.” And yet the passage is by our Lord applied to himself, and that in answer to the enquiry, “ Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?” without giving a direct answer, he replied, “ Go and shew John again those things which you do hear and see : the blind receive their sight ; and the lame walk. &c.” evidently referring to the passage under our consideration. (i. e.) “ I am the person there spoken of, in me is the prophesy fulfilled.” If our Lord had not been God, this would have been evidently calculated to have led the enquirers to have treated him with an idolatrous regard ; or to have considered him as a blasphemous impostor, who impiously arrogated to himself the titles and honours of the true God.

Isaiah.

Isaiah. chap. vi. ver. 1. 11. The prophet relates a vision he had of “ the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple;” Seraphims, with covered faces, in token of the most profound reverence, were the attendants on the Divine Majesty; and they cried, one unto another, “ Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.” Such was the glory of the appearance, that the prophet, filled with holy awe, exclaimed. “ Woe is me, for I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of Hosts. Who could doubt but that the person whom Isaiah in vision saw; and from whom he received the message unto the people, “ hear ye indeed, but understand not, &c.” ver. 9. and 10. was the Supreme Being: and yet we learn from indisputable authority that this was Jesus Christ: “ These things said Esaias when he saw his (Christ’s) glory, and spake of him.” John. chap. xii. ver. 41.

Compare also, Isaiah. chap. xl. ver. 3. and 11. with Luke. chap. i. ver. 76. and Isaiah. chap. xlv. ver. 23. with Rom. chap. xiv. ver. 10. and 11.

Thus,

Thus, then, it appears, that what the sacred Scriptures say of the love of the Father in sending his son to the world ;—of the superlative greatness of the gift, and of the love of Christ in thus undertaking and accomplishing the redemption of his people ; cannot with propriety be accounted for, if he were not essentially God. That they ascribe to him the peculiar titles and perfections of God : that the peculiar works of God are said to be performed by him : that the honors due to God only, are given to him ; and that passages evidently spoken of the Supreme Being, are, by the pen of inspiration, applied to him. If all this be not sufficient to establish the fact, that Jesus Christ is God, one with, and equal to the divine Father, I know not what kind of evidence could possibly have been offered, which would have been thought conclusive.

I would desire the reader, not to consider the subject as a matter of mere speculation. If Jesus Christ be God, he ought to be treated by us as such.

If he be truly God as well as man, he is a proper object to trust in for salvation. His sacrifice is of infinite worth, and sufficient to put away sin,
his

his arm is omnipotent to deliver. “ He is able to save unto the uttermost, all them that come unto God by him.” But if he be not God, trust in him is vain, yea, wicked ; for cursed is man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm.

With Mr. Kingsford I chearfully submit my remarks to the consideration of the publick.

That both writer and reader may have an increasing acquaintance with the adorable Jesus ; so as to admire his infinite excellence, and rejoice, and triumph in his salvation now, and ever : may God of his infinite mercy grant ! Amen.

P I N I S.



